Editor
Boston Globe
Boston, MA

7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Md. 21702
8/27/91

Dear Editor,

I hope you enjoy being made a fool - a real sucker pf-because that is what your Jay Carr did in the story that appeared in The Hollywood Reporter of the 15th and in the Chicago Tribune of the 21st. You have added apparent widespread syndication to one of the least hidden commercializations and exploitations of the JFK assassination ever. You will have helped it mislead and deceive the largest possible audience of still -sorrowing Americans and you will help Stone make a hero of the fraud who treated us all so wretchedly, Jim Garrison.

Just because Stone says he revised the script six times does not mean that he made any major change in it. He couldn't, without junking the whole thing. As your reporter should have been able to figure out for himself from what Stone has said about his travesty-first that it is based on Jim Garrison's fantasy book and second that he added to it the theories of others in Jimm Marrs' "Crossfire." The most casual examination of each leaves it without question that at best they are not real. They are much, much worse.

I am among the many misled and deceived by Garrison and I saved him from disaster more than once by preventing some of the ghastly things he actually planned. You'd never guess it from his book. He merely lies, even when it isn't necessary.

If your reporter read Lardner's story he knew I was the source and that I'd given the Post the script. ~~He publishes~~ Can accept all that obviously self-serving Stone guff without question yet ~~and~~ doesn't ask any questions to learn whether or not it is true?

Does the Globe accept that ~~of~~ from cubs?

When I first heard that Stone was basing his ~~book~~ script on Garrison's book I wrote him in some detail 2/10/91. I included an FBI record making it clear that Garrison lied about one of the matters I refer to above and I never heard from Stone. I wrote him again after the Post extended exceptional courtesies to him and he did not respond. Later one who had no concept of what real research is but ~~who~~ has the title of his "research coordinator" did ~~later~~ write me, what I take as a thinly-disguised offer of a bribe. I've not heard since.

But there were no FBI or CIA records the Warren Commission could not have had if it had wanted them, Dulles could not possibly have communicated their content to the fellow members (particularly when the staff not the members did the work) and despite what Stone told your childishly unquestioning and factually ignorant reporter, and despite what Stone used to say until I wrote him, that all government records were suppressed until at least 2039, almost as soon as the Commission's life ended it began the transfer of its records to the National Archives for processing for public disclosure. I was working in them in early 1966 and they then took up 200 cubic feet! But your child in a man's job just swallowed what Stone makes up. Any reading of what he has said makes it clear that he

makes it up as he goes. And so far as his claim to have done his homework is concerned, aside from my six books on the JFK assassination, I have about a quarter of a million pages of once-withheld government records obtained under a series of FOIA lawsuits, some precedental, everyone working in the field knows I regard myself as surrogate for the people when I use FOIA and make all those records freely available, and neither Stone nor that collector of fairy tales she calls research accepted the offer of access.

Of course he does not want or need it. He pretends he is factual but has neither interest in nor association with fact. He began saying he was recording their history for the people and would tell them who killed JFK, why and how. After he got wind of what I told and gave Gardner, he started backing off. But he can't take back what he got extensive publicity for and can't take it out of peoples' minds. It will be used to promote an obscenity.

That monster even calls his film "JFK" and for his production company took the title "Camelot." Do you have to be hit with a live skunk before you smell anything?

If you are interested, you can have access to what I wrote Stone to which he did not respond and the letter from his joke of a research coordinator, Carr. I enclose the letter I wrote him when I received the version used by The Hollywood Reporter. I'm glad that what you syndicated omitted the indecency of his trading on my name when he knows despite his contrary pretenses that I am responsible for the criticism he has gotten and to which he has actually never responded. He hasn't tangled with me and he won't, especially not when all the reporters revert to childish adulation when he deigns to speak to them and forget what reporting really is. Or at least was in my youth.

I'm sorry about the typing. For health, including vision ~~readings~~ nearing, it can't be any better. I'm sorry, too, that your paper could convert itself into a fan-club solicitation for a man who is rewriting the history of a great tragedy and is so utterly contemptuous of the existing and available fact and has a good time making fools of people like your Carr, his editors and those who printed his crap on syndication.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg